DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 648 JC 730 017

TITLE	A Summary of the Presidents' Conference, Mills College, Oakland, California, June 23-26, 1969.
SPONS AGENCY	California Univ., Berkeley.; College Entrance Examination Board, Palo Alto, Calif.; Mills Coll., Oakland, Calif.; Stanford Univ., Calif.; Wright Inst., Berkeley, Calif.
PUB DATE	Jun 69
NOTE	13p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Caucasians; *College Role; College Students; Conference Reports; Higher Education; *Negro Students; *Presidents; *Student Attitudes; Student College Relationship; Universities

ABSTRACT

An attempt is made to present highlights of the various sessions of a conference of college presidents. The conference is summarized under several headings: (1) How students of color feel and behave as representatives of their culture, (2) What the students of color want, what they are proposing to do, and what they think should be done, (3) The White radicals--what they are saying and how they are received and understood by others, (4) Institutional response: included here are both what the Presidents had to say about what they are doing and supposed to do and also various analyses of the college or university as a social institution, and (5) What is to be done, what is being done. (Author/CK)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 071649

A SUMMARY OF THE PRESIDENTS' CONFERENCE

Mills College
Oakland, California

June 23-26, 1969

Sponsored by:

The Wright Institute

Mills College

University of California, Berkeley

College Entrance Examination Board

and

Stanford University

JC 130 017

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 26 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

This will be a rather subjective summary. I shall attempt to set down here some of the highlights of the various sessions and add some of my own impressions. The conference can, I think, be summarized under several headings: (1) How students of color feel and how they behave as representatives of their culture, (2) What the students of color want, what they are proposing to do, and what they think should be done, (3) The White radicals - what they are saying and how they are received and understood by others, (4) Institutional response: included here are both what the Presidents had to say about what they are doing and supposed to do and also various analyses of the college or university as a social institution, (5) What is to be done, what is being done.

"HOW IT IS" WITH STUDENTS. I will include here not only the presentations of Chuck Hamilton and Al Price on Monday morning, but also something of what was revealed by Orlando Taylor, Bob Johnson, Bob Hoover, Anthony Garcia, and Fernando Hernandez. The speakers Monday morning set out to tell what it's like to be Black at Harvard and Princeton. They succeeded very well. Probably most of those present had heard intelligent and aggressive Black students "tell it like it is" before, but I doubt if many had heard this done with more wit, and irony. I won't attempt to summarize what they said here; rather I'll express the hope that we can get from them something they have written about the general subject of their presentation. Both spoke in favor of "Afro-Americans for Higher Education," a program for gaining admission for more Black students to institutions of higher education and getting these institutions to adapt themselves to the presence and to the needs of these students. What came through to me most clearly in Chuck Hamilton's presentation was his demonstration that it is indeed possible to live in two cultures. There was no question about his Black identity, and yet he would be hard put to it to deny that he bears some of the stigmata of aculturation at Harvard. Similarly in the case of Al Price: he made a point of not being turned into a Princeton man, but he need not have worried because nobody could doubt his solidarity with the Black Community. Al Price went on to make a formal presentation concerning types of people to be found in the Black Community and the kinds of institutional responses that are being made. He made it quite clear we are not to look at the Black Community as monolithic. Rather that community is highly differentiated. But it makes sense to group neutrals, moderates, and militants - each of which he went on to define.

To get some of the meaning of what happened Monday morning we can leap ahead to Monday evening and the reactions of the Black students to a remark John Egerton made in order to get the discussion going. He said he did not consider Chuck and Al to be "militant." What I think John meant was the same thing that I heard some of the Presidents say and what I myself would have said. That is, that he could work with students like Chuck and Al. That he did not regard them as destructive and that he shared their basic goals. Actually what Chuck and Al were advocating was nothing that any president could very well oppose on principle: that is, the admission of more students of color to universities and four year colleges and adaptive responses by these institutions, responses that took into account the nature and needs of these students. What was striking was the realism of the demands of these students, that is to say, their willingness to accept a low order response,

such as finding surrogate parents for Black students on Parents Day at Princeton. And to go on from there to the next response instead of threatening extreme actions unless a wide range of demands were met at once.

In this light it was particularly interesting but at the same time understandable, that the Black students should take such strong exception to John Egerton's suggestion that they were not militant. To understand this, one would only need to go back to Al Price's division of the Black Community into neutrals, moderates, and militants. Given his definitions of these types it is plain that no self-respecting young Black person could regard himself as anything but militant. As the conference went on, we were to learn of the great importance of distinguishing between militancy and destructiveness or nihilism. Given the situation of ethnic minorities in this country today, no reasonable person could complain about militant efforts to alter that situation through building up new programs for action.

Bob Johnson, Orlando Taylor, and Bob Hoover spent most of their time talking about programs that they have instituted or are trying to institute, but as backgrounds for these efforts they told us a lot about how things look from the perspective of someone living in a Black Community. When what they had to say was taken in conjunction with the contributions of Anthony Garcia and Fernando Hernandez, there were few among us, I believe, who were not convinced of the reality and viability of Black, Brown and Red Cultures and of the enormous importance of their preservation. One could understand why "integration" seems not only irrelevant, but actually dangerous from the point of view of a person of color who is struggling for the well-being and development of his people. History shows that for many, many years we had two policies toward the American Indian and that the two have alternated, depending on who was commissioner of Indian affairs at a particular time. One commissioner, of what might be called the liberal persuasion, would be dedicated to the integration of Indians into White American culture, and the next would come along and advocate the preservation of the great cultures which Indians had created on this continent. Today it seems apparent that those who would preserve the Indian cultures were right and it also seems apparent that if Indian societies are left to determine their own fate, with the assistance that is their due as citizens of the United States, they can preserve their cultures and at the same time benefit from some of the acheivements of a technological age. It became increasingly clear as the conference proceeded, that Black and Chicano cultures should be regarded in much the same way.

We can turn now to a consideration of what students of color want. Here we may summarize much that was said under two headings, Ethnic Studies Programs, and Participation in Governance at the University.

ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAMS. The need and the desire for ethnic studies programs became increasingly clear to all as the conference proceeded, and accordingly were made the main theme of the press release. The following expresses the consensus among those present.

1. Education beyond the high school is a right rather than a privilege.

2. In our affluent society, it no longer makes sense to regard education as if it were a scarce commodity to be distributed according to some system of merit. We educate people because they are our own and because the fullest possible development of each of our citizens is the first business of our democracy.

3. There are different conceptions of how the goal of full development is to be reached and, accordingly, there are and should be various kinds of institutions and programs. All the kinds of institutions that are needed for the purposes stated here do not yet exist; new ones must be created.

4. We are fully committed to education at the college level for people of color. This is part of our committment to universal higher education.

5. In planning for the education of people of color, we recognize, indeed, insist upon the concept of self-determination. There is no place for a domestic "Alliance for Progress" in which the white majority, with a virtual monopoly of money and power, makes the plans and rewards the people who go along. Educational programs for people of color must be planned by people of color and the resources of our predominantly white society must be made instrumental to those plans. Institutions of higher learning will have to trust those people of color recognized as educational leaders in the communities they represent.

6. We expect people of color to be militant in the service of their basic values, in seeking to attain what in their view they need for the development of themselves and their children. Militancy in the interest of building up communities and programs is not to be feared or resented.

We strongly favor some of the ethnic studies programs now being advocated by the educational leaders of people of color, for example, the program proposed by Orlando Taylor at the University of Indiana. This is not to say that we favor all ethnic studies programs; certainly not those that are piecemeal or weak and not those that are put into operation merely to silence groups of students. We favor ethnic studies programs that address themselves to the liberation of people of color through the development of self-understanding and self-determination. Peoples of color need ethnic studies programs for the same reason white people need and have provided themselves with studies of Greek civilization, Western civilization and the history of the United States, that is to say, so that they may know themselves and their roots. The solidarity gained from such study need not create separatism. Rather, such solidarity may insure respect for differences.

Ethnic studies programs should include training for socially relevant work. Students need the skills and knowledge which, when applied, will improve the communities in which they live. The reconstruction of the great cities whose populations are or are becoming predominantly non-white will

require technology that can be acquired only through intensive training; it will also require sensitivity to the needs and identities of the people who live in those communities. Here the objectives of education and of training come together, for it is precisely the training here proposed that develops in an individual the social responsibility and sense of worth that characterize the fully developed person.

Having in mind the way in which other areas of knowledge, e.g. space science, have been developed in this country, the Conference proposes a number of regional centers for ethnic studies. These centers could exist within major urban universities or independently but in relationships with various institutions in a given area. We are talking about centers that bring together talent of a high order to focus on the needs of cities, to undertake inquiries into those needs, to train the people who will live in and become leaders in those cities. We are talking about the order of priority and the kind of concentration of resources accorded our space program. We want to see concentrations of Black, Brown or Red intellectuals, scholars, scientists, teachers and not merely a diffusion of talent in ethnic studies programs in numerous institutions of higher education throughout the nation. We are talking about ethnic studies centers which place their emphasis on the right of all people to higher education, on the kind of education that must be provided for peoples of color, and on the recognized ability of peoples of color to regulate and determine their own destinies.

In my view, the reason that Orlando Taylor, Bob Johnson, Bob Hoover, and Don Henderson were so convincing in their calls for Black Studies Programs was because the speakers already mentioned were able to give such vivid pictures of what it means to be a Black in America, and of how much Black culture there really is.

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE. Students also want, of course, rather full participation in campus governance. And this became clear enough in the panel presentation Monday afternoon. This session failed to generate a great deal of excitement, probably because it soon became clear that nobody really objects to pretty full participation in governance by students. Nobody objected when Al Price went all out and insisted that student members of admissions committees must have access to records and must be fully trusted by the administration and all concerned. President Wirt of Mills College responded by saying that he could see no objection to this, that in fact it was in keeping with practice at Mills College.

President Birenbaum offered an interesting comment at this session. He suggested that when we were talking about democracy on the campus we ought to give some attention to the non-tenured faculty. He said that he, as a matter of fact, would give attention to the democratic rights of assistant professors before he would turn to those of students.

Probably the highlight of this session for many people was the brief remark of Anthony Garcia, our only representative of the American Indians. He said that since there were practically no Indians enrolled in American universities, he didn't know why he was at this conference, and that probably the only thing for an American Indian to do today was to keep silent. He did inform us that there were 13 American Indians in the student body at the University of California at Berkeley, one half of

whom were leaving for financial reasons. But it was by saying so little that he had his real impact. He left everybody with the conviction that the outrage justly felt by the American Indians was indeed beyond words.

THE WHITE RADICALS. The students of color did not seem to want or need the help of white radical students. In fact, they seemed to think that the white radicals were more of a hindrance than a help. This was probably the main reason why the white radical students were rather pushed into the background throughout our discussions, in spite of the fact that they were well represented, particularly by Steve Weisman of Stanford, and were sympathetically described by Kenneth Keniston.

The question of what is a radical student and what are the main types of radicals (discussed in detail by Keniston), was already raised for everyone as we listened to Dennis Hayes of Stanford and also Steve Weisman. Dennis Hayes, who had just completed his term as president of the student body at Stanford, urged courses of action which by any definition would have to be called radical. Chiefly he urged that the governing boards of colleges and universities be completely reconstituted and made more representative of the various groups of people who really have an interest in the university—a suggestion that had already been the basis for his hard-hitting critique of the Stanford Board of Trustees. He also spoke eloquently to the point that the University should abandon its position of neutrality. It should recognize that it has values and go about promoting them in all possible ways. More than that, Dennis Hayes exhibited a moderate hippie type of grooming, had often been seen walking barefoot around the campus, and had participated in the sit-in at the Applied Electronics Laboratory. And yet nobody, it seems safe to say, was inclined to call Hayes a radical. This seems a nice manifestation of how fast things are changing. Just a few years ago, undoubtedly, Hayes would have been labeled "radical" by almost everyone, as he would today by people like Senator McClelland, who have no tolerance for fine distinctions. It indicates that there is no question of there being sharp and important differences between the position of Hayes, and that of Steve Weisman, the chief difference being, as was made clear during the discussions between them, that Hayes thinks that "reforms within the system" are possible, whereas Weisman thought that the system had to go. Weisman, as a matter of fact, went on to make as clear a presentation of a true radical position as one could hope to hear. And the interesting thing to me was that nobody effectively challenged him. The best that anyone could do was to say that his general position and recommended course of action were unrealistic. He clarified his position by an analysis of the American Council on Education's study of student unrest. He argued that this study is based upon a set of liberal and managerial assumptions about the university, and that it will probably serve the interests of the status quo more than it will those of students or other people at the bottom of the heap. He made it clear that he was speaking from the point of view of a socialist, and no one could doubt but that he was consistent in maintaining this position. Possibly the reason why his presentation and the supporting remarks by Jean Freedman, also of Stanford, did not lead to any very stimulating discussion was because nobody believed that the time was ripe for a socialist revolution in this country, and that in any case activities to further this goal were not likely to be of much help to students of color. Nevertheless, Weisman did derive from his position the notion that the

psychological testing and examining of students may be not only counter-revolutionary, but anti-humanistic, a notion that has been slow to win acceptance among social scientists representing the traditional liberal point of view. It was only a year ago that I began to see that psychological tests rarely served the interests of those tested and that student protests against psychological testing were in the offing.

Kenneth Keniston had just come from an international conference on student activism, and was able to give us the most up-to-date views on this much discussed subject. He made it clear, as he has before in his writings, that he sees student activism in a context of historical development, but that, at the same time, as a psychologist he is interested in ways in which student activists differ from other students. In this latter regard, he does not see himself merely as one who is trying to figure out "what went wrong" in the development of radical students, but also, and perhaps more important, trying to figure out why some students are the first to see the evils of our society, and the first to take action effecting them. Referring to the conference that he had just attended, he stressed the fact that student activism is much the same all over the world. Student activism is a world-wide phenomenon, although specific issues vary with local conditions, for example, in Japan, students are opposing the American presence there, whereas in France, the object of attack by students was the rigid university system. As in the United States, radical students in various countries of the world tend to be an elitist group. There are differences to be noted between the highly developed and the so-called developing nations. In the highly developed, industrialized nations, things are much as in the United States. Here student activists seem to be after new styles of life, tend to accent creativity, and to be somewhat romantic and anarchistic. Living and working within the university, they are likely to overestimate their power. In the developing nations, on the other hand, student activists are more like the Blacks in the United States; that is to say, they tend to be realistic and practical, seeking goals that can actually be attained. As to why the movement is world-wide, Keniston was inclined to stress the instant communication of today, and also the affluence which makes it possible for young people to take seriously the best ideals of their countries. In response to a question about possible differences between women and men in radical movements, he sighted Brewster Smith on the point that in this regard there seem to be few psychological differences between the sexes. Keniston, however, thought that it was somewhat harder for women to be radical and that when they are, they show more signs of being mixed-up psychologically. There seemed to be much agreement with Keniston's observations. Today's student radicals, unlike those of the past, may not wind up as regular members of the establishment. There was some gloomy comment which Keniston contributed to the effect that White radicals seemed to be less people-oriented than they were when they started, six or eight years ago. Like other radical movements, the student movement tends to become more ideological and rigid, and hence to become more fragmented, as would appear to have been exemplified by the recent SDS convention. One great difficulty of the White radicals is that they, unlike the students of color, have no obvious group of people to organize. In response to questions, Keniston took the view that the increasing use of police power on campuses will not cool things off, but will in fact lead to more violence.

As suggested earlier, white radicals and students of color are not natural allies, and will probably have difficulty as they have had in the past working together. The students of color are more interested in educational issues and educational change, whereas, the White radical students are primarily interested in larger political issues. Fernando Hernandez made the interesting observation that the White radicals may be too aggressive for the Chicano students. As he said, "the SDS member cuts his white, middle-class brother to pieces."

In sum, it appeared that things are tough and will probably get tougher for the White radicals. But this will not prevent them from making things tough for university officialdom.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE. We began to get some response from administrators at the second formal session on Monday morning when Robert Johnson, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs at the University of California at Berkeley, Robert Smith, former president of San Francisco State College, and Robert Wirt, President of Mills College, spoke as members of a panel. As someone pointed out later, members of this panel suc ed in saying what is most upsetting to students. That is, that things are very bad, and not much can be done about it. Vice Chancellor Johnson gave what was probably, from the point of view of most adults present, a grimly realistic account of how things are in California. He saw the University of California, Berkeley, as operating within a state-wide system, not only a system of higher education but a state-wide system of social and political forces that made the university far more determined than determining. University officials are bound to carry out policies not of their own making. They could only tinker with the system on their own campus and await the more fundamental change that is needed. However, much as the University of California, Berkeley, might desire to break the 4% barrier against special admissions, it is up against the fact that the overwhelming power in the state of California is in the hands of White people, and that there is not much reason to expect that they are going to show more concern for other people's children than for their own. He used the word "despair" to describe his feelings about the situation, and could see hope only in a massive new effort to educate the public, or in political change throughout the state.

Robert Smith followed with the gloomy story of events at San Francisco State College. He told how his institution had been involved for several years in a major drive to admit more students of color, of how rapidly things had moved during his administration as during the previous administration of John Summerskill, of how widespread student and faculty support for the admission of students of color had developed, about how four hundred students who were "below the test score standards" had been admitted, and then how everything had been set back following the crisis which led to his forced resignation. Confirming what Robert Johnson had to say, it appeared that the college had moved far beyond what the majority of the White people in the state and their political leaders were prepared for. And hence, the present polarization and regression. The number of "special admissions: has been reduced to one hundred and fifty, and the outlook for the fall is grim.

President Wirt also began by striking a pessimistic note. He reported that at a dinner of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education,

pessimism was the order of the day. No members of the educational establishment saw any hope that the college and university systems would adapt themselves to the demands being made upon them by the new breeds of students. And what was worse, nobody, and this included the sociologists present, seemed to think that any fundamental change on the part of these institutions was desirable. President Wirt, himself, refused to be drawn into this pessimism. Instead, he spoke with enthusiasm about the advances that had been made with respect to ethnic studies and student participation in college affairs at his own institution and at various others. As suggested above, the students present did not have much tolerance for administrative pessimism or stand-patism. They sounded now a note that was to be heard again and again during the conference, that is that presidents and vice chancellors should lead and not merely administer. And here, clearly enough, they were saying something that the presidents did not want to hear. Charles Hamilton and Al Price led the student response to this first "institutional response." They not only reiterated suggestions made earlier, but came forward with some new ones, for example, the suggestion that the administration must find allies among the students, the liberal faculty, and kindred spirits in the larger society, and not depend on the university's traditional structure for getting things done. Someone told me later that the presidents felt somewhat badgered by the Black students and that in off-the-record sessions they were complaining a bit about being put on the spot. Indeed they were quite open about this. Earlier in our deliberations, President Eddy of Chatham College pointed out that the president was not all-powerful; that he had to deal with a diverse constituancy, and that he rarely could stick his neck out. It wasn't, however, until William Birenbaum arrived that we began to get a thorough-going analysis of institutional response.

Dr. Birenbaum, in his formal presentation, relieved the situation, that is, put everybody more at ease, by giving an historical perspective for our present controversies and conflicts, and by showing that blame could be widely distributed and not focused primarily upon administrators. He pointed out that the history of higher education could be written in terms of the rise and fall of different power groups, students, faculties, boards, administration. But his main point was that the original model of the college or university was the monastery, and that this institution is changing, and must change much faster, in the direction of being a community institution. That is to say, an institution in the community, one that interacts freely with other institutions in the community and is more like a true city than a monastery. The true city, he pointed out, forces choices, makes confrontation a way of life, and hence develops a tolerance for controversy, whereas the traditional college occupies itself with internal conflicts with few consequences for life outside the college. The big task today is to tear down the walls. First tear down the walls separating education and action. Here he quoted Silverman on the point that the only excitement in American higher education is in medical schools, and that the best teaching in those institutions occurs in the first two years when students work on cadavers. Meaning, I take it, that teaching is best when students are shown how to relate concepts to laboratory work or to applied work. Second, he would break down the barriers between high school and college, and between college and graduate school. Third, and most important, is to break down the barriers between the university and the community.

The best art is in museums and the best law research is carried out by law firms. In a city like New York, there are hundreds of learning situations outside of the campus. For example, students can help judges and judges can come onto the campus to teach. To make such arrangements, of course, would be to free ourselves from the restraints imposed by academic credentials.

Birenbaum's analysis opened up discussion -- which was continued in several other sessions -- of the roles of the faculty, the president, of the public, and of the governing board. These may be considered briefly in turn.

THE FACULTY. One thing that began to bring students and administrators together was their shared view that the faculty was the major culprit. What Birenbaum had to say on Wednesday afternoon and Wednesday evening, affirmed what John Egerton had been saying Monday evening: that most college and university faculties really preferred to live and work in a community of scholars, and are simply not prepared to see their institutions turned into instruments for mass higher education. Everybody could applaud when Birenbaum summed up much of the discussion by saying that there were two things that could be said about faculties; one was that they were highly knowledgeable about their own interests, which usually took the form of less teaching and more money, and secondly that they knew virtually nothing about their new clientele, that is to say, students of types that were not entering our institutions of higher learning ten years ago.

Robert Smith contributed substantially to the same line of thought in describing in detail the behavior of the faculty during his crisis at San Francisco State College. The main point seemed to be that faculties simply were not effective agencies of government. Although they tried to be helpful, they were defeated by their own organization or lack of it. For example, at one time during the crisis at State, both the academic senate and the administration were overruled by the faculty. But then it turned out that there were so many cleavages within this overruling faculty, that they were not capable of effective action. In fact, nobody within the college was capable of such action. And this situation certainly helped to open the way for action on the part of the trustees and high officials of the state.

It became necessary for some members of the conference to remind the group that faculty members are not all bad, and that they can, in fact, be appealed to to support good actions. As it turned out, there were one or two people present who could speak as faculty members: Ned Opton and myself. We felt it our duty to point out that nothing was to be gained from free-swinging attacks on the likes of us.

THE PRESIDENT. Birenbaum gave an effective description of the president's role, and explanation of why he so rarely meets the student's demand for strong leadership. Birenbaum's point was that the president must look after the interests of all concerned. And that his justice in this will show over time. Most of his mistakes come from his need to defend his power position. He defends his position mainly by withholding information, by making his enemies fight each other, and by setting students, faculty, and board members on senseless courses of action. He offered for the president a convincing

model for democratic leadership. That is to say an arrangement by which the president gets a vote from the faculty or from their chosen representatives and then takes action, reminding the faculty, the while, that this action is being taken in their name.

Probably most presidents or men of experience would agree that this is about the best that can be done in the situation of today. But of course, this could hardly meet the demands of the students for really strong and charismatic leadership. There seemed to be considerable sentiment in favor of the view that while the president was being fair to the faculty by getting them to state openly what their interests were and then looking after those interests, he would do well to form coalitions with students and people outside his institution in order to build in accord with the vision of the college in a community.

THE PUBLIC. The words "the public" or "educate the public" were often heard at the conference, but it must be admitted that we never got around to defining the public or talking about the kinds of public we had in mind. Perhaps it is fair to say that two images of the public were being held in mind by various ones of the conferees. One was the image of a poorly informed or perhaps misinformed public, not strong on good will, that could easily be turned against student activists and the rising students of color by politicians who saw their fate bound up with the support of just this public. The other image was of a public usually referred to, of course, as "the community" that really shared the aims and interests of students of color and perhaps even student activists, who in other words were really interested in good education for their children, who could be rallied by strong presidents who made common cause with the more idealistic students.

We made no real analysis of the public or of which segments of the public are interested in which activities of the university. This matter came rather crucially to the fore during our press conference, when we were asked rather pointedly where the money to support regional centers for ethnic studies was to come from. This is the same as asking what is the public support for this idea. We could only say that we are confronted here with both an educational job and a political job. Clearly such centers are not likely to be supported financially unless strong leadership is taken by educated people of whatever ethnic background. We have to face the fact that probably a majority of educated White people are "liberal" in their attitudes toward the problems that we are concerned about and still see ethnic studies programs as elements of what they still call "separatism". Yet it is possible that their minds can be changed as have been the minds of some of us who attended the conference. This is an educational job. At the same time regional centers are not likely to be established unless strong and vocal groups representing American ethnic minorities really believe that such centers will serve their interests. Here we face a large but not impossible political job. Here there is nothing for it but for those members of ethnic minorities who share our view to organize and to bring pressure to bear on legislative bodies locally, in the states, and nationally. Using as they see fit the help of those members of the White establishment who genuinely favor self-determination by the ethnic minorities as a way of resolving a national problem or who have something to gain from collaboration in a movement led by these members of the minorities.

THE GOVERNING BOARD. Here also we got along without any real definitions or analyses. Dennis Hayes' depiction of the Stanford Board of Trustees as a group most of whom were drawn from the business or corporate world, about half of whom were worse than useless, and the remainder of whom could perhaps be educated to a point where they could make some contribution. This picture was not contradicted nor elaborated on. This seems rather too bad, for very few people are suggesting that boards be dispensed with altogether, or even that their relationships with the college or university be radically changed. Until this is done these boards retain a good deal of power for good or for ill. An obvious point not forceably made at the conference is that our efforts to educate people who have concerns with our college and universities might well begin with their governing boards.

AND YET THINGS GET DONE. Despite the strong notes of pessimism that were struck from time to time throughout the conference, the fact is that planned change does occur in American higher education. It is occuring at an increasing rate. And it can be made to occur even more often. In fact, many members of the conference have themselves been involved in progressive change and are so involved now. Perhaps their modesty prevented us from hearing more about these changes. For example, Pressley McCoy has somehow succeeded in getting a totally new brand of college established within the University of Redlands. President Wirt barely hinted at the ways in which Mills College is moving with the times. President Birenbaum could have told us at much greater length about how far his institution has actually moved toward becoming the kind of a college-in-a-community that he envisioned. And so on for various other members of the conference. It seems entirely appropriate that no one was in the mood for self-congratulations, for it is painfully evident that in the area that concerned us most, namely, educational opportunities for students of color, progress is virtually nil. The reason for pointing to changes that have occurred is so that we might learn something from them about how to induce desirable changes.

In this connection it is worth recalling that important changes sometimes come from the top. Consider the University of California at Santa Cruz, for example, surely a very significant innovation in American higher education. This was simply an idea advanced by myself and others at Berkeley in 1957-58, when we almost succeeded in starting an experimental college on the campus. Clark Kerr picked up the idea and convinced the Board of Regents of its viability. Direct pressure from students or from the faculty or from the public had very little to do with the matter. I dare say much the same conditions held for the establishment of Johnston College at the University of Redlands, and for various other new colleges and programs.

Some of us were happy to note also that the president may still play a key role in significant change. President Brewster of Yale, for example, was mentioned several times as a man who was largely responsible for radical changes at Yale. We all became aware too, that Robert Smith almost pulled off a radical, progressive change at San Francisco State where he worked with large, supporting groups of students and faculty members. It appears that he was finally defeated by the rigid system of budgeting for state colleges, a system that made it impossible to get hold of the few thousand dollars that would have made it possible to fulfill promises made concerning

admissions of students of color, and beginnings of ethnic studies programs. The point is, that whereas students continue to supply the major motive force for change in higher education, they are not the only force, and they do not have to feel that they are without allies.

Our news release with its recommendation for the establishment of regional centers for ethnic studies is not only a proposal for change, but an expression of changes that have occurred already. We could hardly be talking about regional centers for ethnic studies, if demonstratively viable ethnic studies programs were not in existence already. It needs only to be said that if changes of the sort that are now being promoted by students and educators of color continue to be made, then the way will be open to all kinds of changes in our institutions of higher learning. The setting up of the right kind of ethnic studies programs really involves a change in the structure of the university, a break with some of the most cherished faculty traditions -- most particularly, perhaps, those having to do with the accreditation of teachers. Such a change in structure is like the breaking of a log jam. Happily, the kind of education that the black, brown and red educators want for their people is the kind that is good for all people. White society owes them a debt of gratitude, for their efforts in behalf of their own people serve at the same time the long range interests of the white society; and it may be hoped that they will take satisfaction in the fact that what they are really doing is serving all humanity.